

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being canceled.

Claims 1 and 8 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-13 are now pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. Section 112, First Paragraph Rejection of Claims 1, 8 and 9-13

In the final Office Action, claims 1, 8 and 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the final Office Action. Claims 1 and 8 were amended in the now-entered reply filed on July 19, 2004, to remove the negative limitation from those claims, thereby mooting the rejection of those claims.

Also, with respect to claims 9-13, please refer to Figure 7 of the drawings, whereby the landmark position database 54 is not part of the Web 55 (to thereby provide support for claims 10, 12 and 13), and please also refer to Figure 1 of the drawings which provides support in element 2 for the features recited in claims 9 and 11. In particular, please note that Figure 1 clearly shows all of the information stored in the Landmark Database 2 as unit records, and thus the features recited in claims 9 and 11 are fully supported by this figure, as well as by page 6, lines 22-26 of the specification. Accordingly, claims 9-13 are believed to fully comply with 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph.

Prior Art Rejection of Claims:

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (specification, page 6, lines 10-20) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,307,573 to Barros; claims 2 and 4-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Barros and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,577,714 to Darcie et al.; claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Barros and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,763 to Yoshioka; and claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in view of Barros and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,479 to Barton. These rejections are traversed with respect to the present pending claims, for at least the reasons given below.

Presently pending independent claims 1 and 8 have each been amended to explicitly recite that the textual expression pertaining to a name and contents of the corresponding landmark as obtained from the database as a keyword, the keyword being used by said search means as a search term for searching the World Wide Web. In Barros, on the other hand, while it may be true that back-end databases 504 shown in Figure 4 of that reference are utilized in order to obtain more information on landmarks that are listed in a topical database 203, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Barros that a textual expression is obtained from the topical database 203 in order to use that textual expression as a search term for use by a search engine in searching the back-end databases 504 for further information on landmarks. Accordingly, since none of the other cited art of record makes up for the above-mentioned deficiencies of Barros, presently pending independent claims 1 and 8 are patentable over the cited art of record.

Dependent Claims:

The dependent claims are patentable due to their dependencies on either base claim 1 or base claim 8, as well as for the specific features recited in those

dependent claims. For example, in its rejection of claim 6, the Office Action asserts that Barton discloses many of the features recited in this claim. With respect to several of the features recited in claim 6, Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, claim 6 recites a time storage section for storing a minimum stay duration in a landmark area, in advance, which is used to determine whether the user is interested in a specific landmark or not. Thus, if a user stays at a particular landmark for over 5 minutes, for example, the user is deemed to be interested in that particular landmark, and an instruction log retention section records a unit record corresponding to the user being interested in that particular landmark.

In Barton, on the other hand, a timer is used to measure a time duration that a user stays at a particular area, whereby that information is then stored. See column 17, lines 51-60 of Barton, for example. However, whether or not a user stays for a millisecond or for 10 hours is immaterial since information for both stays is stored in the system of Barton. Thus, there is no criteria in Barton in which the user must stay at a particular location for at least a minimum stay duration before a unit record corresponding to the user staying at that particular location is stored in a database.

Accordingly, claim 6 is patentable for this additional reason.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 3, 2008

Phillip J. Articola
Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5300
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399